APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/846,712	04/30/2001	Kursat Uvez	05306.P027	4919

7590   02/26/2004

Glenn Von Tersch
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER
BULLOCK JR, LEWIS ALEXANDER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2126	7

DATE MAILED: 02/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/846,712	UVEZ ET AL.
Examiner	**Art Unit**	
Lewis A. Bullock, Jr.	2126	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _11/28/03_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-19_ is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-19_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _29 August 2001_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

       1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

       3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2.   Claims 10-12, 14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by STONE (US 6,101,510).

As to claim 10, STONE teaches a server (server program) comprising: means

for receiving a request (method request / Navigate request) pertaining to an object

(hypertext viewer / software object) associated with a network based application (web

browser control / COM server program) from a third party application (client application)

(col. 8, line 10 – col. 9, line 5; col. 16, lines 1-67; col. 3, lines 23-38; col. 12, lines 51-53;

col. 6, lines 20-43; col. 9, lines 37-58; col. 10, lines 1-14); means for dynamically

requesting a datum (web page) of an object (hypertext viewer) from a network based

application (web browser control) responsive to the request (col. 8, line 10 – col. 9, line

5; col. 16, lines 1-67; col. 3, lines 23-38; col. 12, lines 51-53; col. 6, lines 20-43; col. 9,

lines 37-58; col. 10, lines 1-14); and means for transmitting the datum (web page) to the

third party application (create the web page and return it in the frame created by the

application) (col. 8, line 10 – col. 9, line 5; col. 16, lines 1-67; col. 3, lines 23-38; col. 12,

lines 51-53; col. 6, lines 20-43; col. 9, lines 37-58; col. 10, lines 1-14).

As to claim 11, STONE teaches the server (server program), the network based

application (web browser control / COM server program) and the third party application

(client application) are installed on a personal computer (computer system for

navigating to a web site) (col. 4, lines 51-54; col. 2, line 66 – col. 4, line 32).

As to claim 12, STONE teaches the network-based application (web browser

control) includes a World Wide Web site (via the Navigate request) (col. 8, line 56 – col.

9, line 5; col. 16, lines 23-43).

As to claim 14, STONE teaches cited teachings as disclosed above and that the

browser control can be contained in any application that satisfies the requirements of an

OLE container (col. 10, lines 1-43). STONE also teaches the web browser control acts

as an OLE container (col 10, lines 34-40). Hence, the browser control is allowed to be

an OLE container to another browser control. Therefore, it is inherent in the teachings

of STONE that the browser control is a client application to another browser control.

As to claim 16, STONE teaches the server (server program) includes a

programmatic interface (implementation of the member functions) to communicate with

the object (hypertext viewer) (via the browser control) (col. 8, lines 10-39).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 1-9, 13, and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over STONE (US Patent 6,101,510) in view of "Understanding ActiveX

and OLE" by CHAPPELL.

As to claim 1, STONE teaches a computing system (col. 4, lines 51-54)

comprising: a network based application (web browser control / COM server program)

associated with an object (hypertext viewer / software object) (col. 10, lines 15-40); and

a server (server program) to receive a request (method request / Navigate request)

pertaining to the object (hypertext viewer) from an application (client application) (col. 8,

line 10 – col. 9, line 5; col. 16, lines 1-67; col. 3, lines 23-38; col. 12, lines 51-53; col. 6,

lines 20-43; col. 9, lines 37-58; col. 10, lines 1-14), to dynamically access the object

(hypertext viewer) in response to the request (method request / Navigate request) and

to transfer a datum (web page) of the object to the application (create the web page and

return it in the frame created by the application) (col. 8, line 10 – col. 9, line 5; col. 16,

lines 1-67; col. 3, lines 23-38; col. 12, lines 51-53; col. 6, lines 20-43; col. 9, lines 37-58;

col. 10, lines 1-14). STONE also teaches the browser control can be contained in any

application that satisfies the requirements of an OLE container (col. 10, lines 1-43).

However, STONE does not teach that the container application is a non-network application.

CHAPPELL teaches that an OLE container is a non-network application (WORD / EXCEL applications) (pg. 174). Therefore, it would be obvious to combine the teachings of STONE with the teachings of CHAPPELL in order to provide a link and embedded data from a server without being aware of what kind of application the other is (pg. 174).

As to claim 2, STONE teaches the computing system includes a personal computer (computer system for navigating to a web site) (col. 4, lines 51-54; col. 2, line 66 – col. 4, line 32).

As to claim 3, STONE teaches the server and the network based applications are installed on the personal computer (col. 4, lines 51-54).

As to claim 4, STONE teaches the object (hypertext viewer) includes the datum (web page) and a method to manipulate the datum (rendering and displaying the web page) (col. 10, line 59 – col. 11, line 6; col. 12, lines 50-53; col. 10, lines 24-29).

As to claim 5, STONE teaches the server (server program) is to access the object (hypertext viewer) to retrieve the datum (web page) (col. 8, lines 40-48; col. 10, line 59 – col. 11, line 6; col. 12, lines 50-53; col. 10, lines 24-29).

As to claim 6, STONE teaches the server (server program) is to transmit the received datum (web page) to the application (client application) (via displaying the application in the frame created by the client) (col. 9, lines 37-58). STONE also teaches the browser control can be contained in any application that satisfies the requirements of an OLE container (col. 10, lines 1-43). However, STONE does not teach that the container application is a non-network application.

CHAPPELL teaches that an OLE container is a non-network application (WORD / EXCEL applications) (pg. 174). Therefore, it would be obvious to combine the teachings of STONE with the teachings of CHAPPELL in order to provide a link and embedded data from a server without being aware of what kind of application the other is (pg. 174).

As to claim 7, STONE teaches a computer-implemented method comprising: receiving a request (method request / Navigate request) pertaining to an object (hypertext viewer) associated with a network based application (web browser control / COM server program) (col. 10, lines 15-40) from an application (client application) (col. 8, line 10 – col. 9, line 5; col. 16, lines 1-67; col. 3, lines 23-38; col. 12, lines 51-53; col. 6, lines 20-43; col. 9, lines 37-58; col. 10, lines 1-14); dynamically accessing the object (hypertext viewer) in response to the request (method request / Navigate request); and transferring a datum (web page) of the object to the application (create the web page and return it in the frame created by the application) (col. 8, line 10 – col. 9, line 5; col.

16, lines 1-67; col. 3, lines 23-38; col. 12, lines 51-53; col. 6, lines 20-43; col. 9, lines

37-58; col. 10, lines 1-14). STONE also teaches the browser control can be contained

in any application that satisfies the requirements of an OLE container (col. 10, lines 1-

43). However, STONE does not teach that the container application is a non-network

application.

CHAPPELL teaches that an OLE container is a non-network application (WORD

/ EXCEL applications) (pg. 174). Therefore, it would be obvious to combine the

teachings of STONE with the teachings of CHAPPELL in order to provide a link and

embedded data from a server without being aware of what kind of application the other

is (pg. 174).

As to claim 8, STONE teaches the object (hypertext viewer) includes the datum

(web page) and a method to manipulate the datum (rendering and displaying the web

page) (col. 10, line 59 – col. 11, line 6; col. 12, lines 50-53; col. 10, lines 24-29).

As to claim 9, STONE teaches the server (server program) is to retrieve and

transmit the datum (web page) to the application (client application) (via displaying the

application in the frame created by the client) (col. 9, lines 37-58). STONE also teaches

the browser control can be contained in any application that satisfies the requirements

of an OLE container (col. 10, lines 1-43). However, STONE does not teach that the

container application is a non-network application.

CHAPPELL teaches that an OLE container is a non-network application (WORD / EXCEL applications) (pg. 174). Therefore, it would be obvious to combine the teachings of STONE with the teachings of CHAPPELL in order to provide a link and embedded data from a server without being aware of what kind of application the other is (pg. 174).

As to claim 13, STONE teaches cited teachings as disclosed above and that the browser control can be contained in any application that satisfies the requirements of an OLE container (col. 10, lines 1-43). However, STONE does not teach that the third party container application is a non-network application.

CHAPPELL teaches that an OLE container is a non-network application (WORD / EXCEL applications) (pg. 174). Therefore, it would be obvious to combine the teachings of STONE with the teachings of CHAPPELL in order to provide a link and embedded data from a server without being aware of what kind of application the other is (pg. 174).

As to claims 17-19, reference is made to a machine readable medium that corresponds to the method of claims 7-9 and is therefore met by the rejection of claims 7-9 above.

3.   Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over STONE (US Patent 6,101,510) in view of "ActiveX Programming Unleashed" by CHEN, Weiying.

As to claim 15, STONE teaches the network based application (browser control / container) includes a script (script / scripting language added by the application) (col. 4, lines 23-29; col. 23, lines 47-58). However, STONE does not teach that the script or scripting language is JavaScript.

CHEN a network based application (web browser control) (pg. 3, 1st 5th – 7th paragraphs) containing any Document Objects and that Java Script document objects embodies properties of a web page (pgs. 14 and 17-18). It is obvious to one skilled in the art that since the browser control contains any document objects and that JavaScript is a form of a document object that the browser control contains JavaScript document objects. Therefore, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of STONE with the teachings of CHEN in order to render / load HTML pages into a browser (pg. 14).

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. In particular, the amending of all the claims in scope to detail a network based application associated with an object, and a server to receive a request pertaining to the object from a non-network based application, to dynamically access

the object in response to the request and to transfer a datum of the object to the non-

network based application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Lewis A. Bullock, Jr. whose telephone number is (703)

305-0439. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:30 am - 5:00

pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Meng An can be reached on (703) 305-9678. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

lab